

Applicants : Bryan T. Baker et al
Serial No. : 10/047,300
Page : 2

If no generic claim of the elected Group I claims is finally held allowable, Examiner Pascua has required Restriction between the following allegedly patently distinct species:

Species IV : Figs. 1-9
Species V : Figs. 10-15
Species VI : Figs. 16-18

The examiner asserts that no claim is generic to the recited species. Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that independent claim 1 of elected Group I is generic to all the Species IV, V and VI. Specifically, (1) claim 1 includes no material element in addition to those of the species shown in each of the figures (M.P.E.P. §806.04(d)); (2) claim 1 comprehends within its confines organization covered in each of the species (M.P.E.P. §806.04(d)); and (3) each of the embodiments shown in Figs. 1-18 are within the breadth and scope of the definition of claim 1 (M.P.E.P. §806.04(e)).

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is generic to all the allegedly distinct Species IV, V and VI, and therefore, the Species should be examined together. If no generic claim of the Group I claims is allowable, Applicants elects Species IV, claims 1-7.

Applicants : Bryan T. Baker et al
Serial No. : 10/047,300
Page : 3


CONCLUSION

In view of this election and these remarks, it is respectfully submitted that prosecution on the merits is warranted.

Respectfully submitted,

BRYAN T. BAKER ET AL

By: Warner Norcross & Judd LLP



Gregory P. Bondarenko
Registration No. 44,547
900 Fifth Third Center
111 Lyon Street, N. W.
Grand Rapids, MI 49503-2487
(616) 752-2420

/alg
18537.75054-001
811823-2